

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Title of Airspace Change Proposal</b> | <b>Introduction of Control Areas (CTA) 10X and CTA11</b> |
| <b>Change Sponsor</b>                    | <b>London Southend Airport (LSA)</b>                     |
| <b>SARG Project Leader</b>               | <b>[REDACTED]</b>  |
| <b>Case Study commencement date</b>      | <b>18/02/2020</b>  |
| <b>Case Study report as at</b>           | <b>25/02/2020</b>  |
| <b>File Reference</b>                    | <b>ACP-2017-25</b>                                       |

| <b>Instructions</b>   |
|---|
| <p>In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'Status' column is completed using the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Yes</b></li><li>• <b>No</b></li><li>• <b>Partially</b></li><li>• <b>N/A</b></li></ul> <p>To aid the SARG Project Leader's efficient Project Management it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is resolved <span style="background-color: green; color: white; padding: 2px;">Green</span> <b>not resolved</b> <span style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;">Amber</span> or <b>not compliant</b> <span style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px;">Red</span> as part of the SARG Project Leader's efficient project management.</p> |

## Executive Summary

This report relates to the engagement activities undertaken by London Southend airport (LSA) concerning their proposal to implement control areas (CTA) 10X and 11. Whilst CTA's 10X and 11 originally formed part of LSA's controlled airspace ACP that was approved in 2015, the CAA decided not to approve the implementation of them on the basis that *"complete containment of proposed LSA procedures was not required at this stage due to the number of commercial movements"*. The regulatory decision document also stated that if LSA subsequently presented a separate proposal which included a justification for CTA's 10X and 11 within two-years of implementation of the approved airspace (2<sup>nd</sup> April 2015), they would not be required to undertake further consultation. LSA submitted a separate ACP in March 2017, thereby meeting the criteria set out in the original regulatory decision. However, due to the high ACP-workload and the associated demand on CAA resourcing, the CAA was unable to facilitate a meeting with the change sponsor until August 2018. Following that meeting, the CAA accepted that as LSA had met the criteria set out in the regulatory decision, there was no requirement for them to undertake further consultation. Acknowledging that the original consultation was completed in 2014, the CAA confirmed that it was necessary for LSA to undertake further stakeholder engagement and suggested that they produce an engagement strategy setting out their intentions on how they would ensure that stakeholders were fully informed of the follow-up proposal for CTA's 10X and 11 and given the opportunity to comment on it accordingly. There were numerous email exchanges between the CAA and change sponsor between October 2018 and June 2019, culminating in a letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> July 2019 which confirmed that they could remain on the CAP 725 airspace change process. LSA subsequently commenced their engagement activity on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2019. Whilst it was originally their intention to formally close this engagement activity on the 30<sup>th</sup> August 2019, stakeholders requested an extension and LSA decided to leave it open as they were committed to liaising with stakeholders as required.

|   |   |            |
|---|---|------------|
| 1.  | <b>Engagement Process</b>   |            |
| 1.1   | <b>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary stakeholders received the information?</b> | <b>YES</b> |
| <p>The change sponsor developed a list of targeted stakeholders (185 in total) using details from the original controlled airspace ACP consultation and enhanced this through the addition of stakeholders that had registered an interest and/or new stakeholders likely to be affected. Their 'Engagement Document' clearly stated that the engagement was not limited to the targeted stakeholders confirming that it was <i>"open to anyone who has an interest"</i>.</p> <p>The targeted stakeholders were initially contacted by email on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2019. The email provided relevant context and an explanation of the purpose of the engagement activity. Links to the relevant 'Engagement Document' were provided along with a reference to the associated open evening/briefing session and confirmation of the original deadline (30<sup>th</sup> August 2019). Similar content was provided through hard copy letters which were sent to those stakeholders without an email address.</p> <p>Details of the airspace change proposal were published on a dedicated webpage on the airport website, which included links to the 'Engagement Document' and original controlled airspace ACP consultation material (consultation document and consultation response document). LSA have state within their 'Report of Engagement Activity' that the webpage was viewed 427 times between the 19<sup>th</sup> July and 30<sup>th</sup> August and that there were an addition 81 views between the 31<sup>st</sup> August and 30<sup>th</sup> November.</p> |   |            |

|     |  |            |
|-----|--|------------|
|     | <p>To provide stakeholders with an opportunity to learn more and discuss the proposal in person with LSA representatives, the change sponsor facilitated a related open evening/briefing session on the 20<sup>th</sup> August 2019 between 17:00 and 21:00. This was referenced in the initial/reminder emails that were sent to the targeted stakeholders and related information was made available on the webpage referenced above.</p> <p>The change sponsor also participated in an Airport Consultative Committee meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> September 2019 to brief attendees, which include representatives from local councils, resident's associations, trade councils and airport tenants, on the proposal.</p>   |            |
| 1.2 | <p><b>What % of the targeted stakeholders responded?</b></p> <p>The change sponsor targeted a total of 185 stakeholders; this number was broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NATMAC) Members (39)</li> <li>• National Bodies / Organisations (15)</li> <li>• Airlines &amp; Tenants (20)</li> <li>• Airfields (15)</li> <li>• Private Jets (51)</li> <li>• Essex Councils (35)</li> <li>• MP's and Councillors (10)</li> </ul> <p>From the above list, a total of 19 stakeholders responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NATMAC (3) – British Helicopter Association (BHA), Ministry of Defence – Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management (MoD DAATM) and NATS</li> <li>• National Bodies / Organisations (3) – Airport Consultative Committee, Natural England and Royal Society Protection of Birds (RSPB)</li> <li>• Airlines &amp; Tenants (2) – Ryanair and Stobart Air</li> <li>• Airfields (3) – Eastchurch, Maypole and Rochester</li> <li>• Private Jets (2) – Air X Charter and Terry Holding</li> <li>• Essex Councils (5) – Essex County Council, Maldon District Council, Southend Borough Council, Tillingham Village Council and West Mersea Town Council</li> <li>• MP's and Councillors (1) – Southend Borough Council – Councillor for St Laurence Ward</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the 19 targeted stakeholders which responded, 4 individual stakeholders submitted their feedback, bringing the grand total to 23 stakeholders. Having reviewed all the stakeholder's responses, I am satisfied that the change sponsor has fairly and adequately categorised them as follows:</p> | <b>10%</b> |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support/No Objections (14)</li> <li>• Object/Object pending further information (5)</li> <li>• No Comment (4)</li> </ul> <p>With regards to Maypole, it was noted that there were two submissions from different individuals on behalf of the airfield and that these represented a different viewpoint (one objection dated 23<sup>rd</sup> July and one no objection dated 22<sup>nd</sup> August). Both individuals expressed areas of concern in their submissions and these are covered in more detail in Section 1.4 below.</p>   |     |
| 1.3 | <p><b>Were reasonable steps (e.g. follow-up letters/phone calls) taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from stakeholders?</b></p> <p>The change sponsor was proactive throughout the engagement activity, distributing reminder notifications on two separate occasions (the 8<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> August). Although it was originally their intention to close this engagement window on the 30<sup>th</sup> August 2019, the change sponsor decided to leave it open-ended in response to stakeholder requests for more time; it has not been possible to determine whether the targeted stakeholders were informed accordingly.</p>  | YES |
| 1.4 | <p><b>Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?</b></p> <p>Having reviewed all the stakeholder's responses, I am satisfied that the change sponsor has correctly identified the key themes raised by stakeholders, particularly with regards to those that registered their objections to the proposal. The following summarises these themes and details LSA's response to them:</p> <p><b><u>Flight safety concerns related to low-level sea crossings / increased track miles over the sea</u></b></p> <p>Three stakeholders (BHA, Maypole, an individual) objected to the proposal citing flight safety concerns in relation to low-level sea crossings / increased track miles over the sea. In response, LSA stated that aircraft not wishing to enter the controlled airspace could fly up to the base of CTA's 10X and 11 (3,500 feet) or those wishing to cross at a higher altitude could request a clearance to enter controlled airspace. LSA went on to state that since the implementation of controlled airspace in 2015, air traffic control "<i>have accepted over 99% of the request for entry into the current controlled airspace</i>".</p> <p><b><u>Increase traffic and controller workload means that access to airspace may be delayed / refused</u></b></p> <p>This is linked to the previous point and was raised by one of those stakeholders (BHA) which objected citing flight safety concerns. In response, LSA stated that the implementation of CTA's 10X and 11 will allow them to reposition aircraft out over the sea thereby enhancing ATC's capacity to accommodate transit flights in other parts of the controlled airspace. They also explained that they have two radar positions to manage aircraft operating within the controlled airspace as well as those requiring access to it.</p> <p><b><u>Flight planning concerns due to increased volume of controlled airspace</u></b></p> | YES |

Maypole stated that flights are already severely restricted by EG D136 and EG D138 A/B/C/D and suggested that further controlled airspace would complicate flight planning and increase the risk of airspace infringements. As the majority of CTA 11 and part of CTA 10X would be positioned over EG D138, LSA stated that they would only be used if the Danger Area was not active. It was also noted that Maypole visited LSA on the 20th August 2019 and that because of this meeting, their pilots were *“reassured that Southend ATC appears to be genuine with regard to routing general aviation aircraft above, below and through its airspace”* before concluding that the pilots of Maypole airfield have no objection to the proposal. However, they do also state that their conclusion is *“predicated on the ability of Southend EGMC to provide transit clearance for light aircraft through their CTR/CTA and ATZ when possible and without undue holds”*.

#### **Increase movements/night flights over the Dengie Hundred Peninsula**

Tillingham Village Council expressed concern about the potential for there to be increased movements and night flights over the Dengie Hundred Peninsula. In response, LSA advised that the Peninsula is situated below controlled airspace that was implemented in 2015 and confirmed that it was not their intention to alter the pre-existing airspace arrangements. They also highlighted that the Peninsula lies under the extended approach path and stated that this proposal would not alter the approach patterns. Finally, they referenced the Section 106 agreement which permits LSA to have up to 53,500 movements per annum and the limitations it placed on the number and types of aircraft that can operate in to/out of the airport at night (23:00 to 06:00).

#### **Potential displacement of smaller aircraft to lower altitudes and/or other locations**

Natural England sought assurances that the implementation of CTA's 10X and 11 *“will not cause a displacement of smaller aircrafts, microlights etc. to lower flight heights, or other areas, which will lead to disturbance of protected bird populations”*. LSA explained that most of the airspace associated with CTA's 10X and 11 is over water and concluded that the implementation of them would not change the operating behaviours of general aviation aircraft highlighting that these *“always tend to operate much closer to land if they wish to operate at lower altitudes”*.

#### **Aircraft holding altitudes**

Natural England also expressed concern in relation to the holding altitudes given that the base of CTA's 10X and 11 is proposed to be 3,500 feet and the potential for associated disturbance. LSA explained that the implementation of these portions of controlled airspace, particularly CTA 10X, would allow them to make better use of the GEGMU hold, a holding pattern which was implemented in February 2016 and located over the sea. LSA point out that better use of the GEGMU hold would reduce the requirement to use the SND holding pattern, which is located overland and utilised at lower altitudes (2,000 feet and 3,000 feet). The SND hold also has implications for departing aircraft as they are limited to 2,000 feet after departure whenever an aircraft is holding at 3,000 feet.

#### **Potential for bird strikes (particularly Brent Geese) around Mersea Island**

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Natural England suggested that LSA should consider the potential for bird strikes around the Mersea Island area, highlighting that it could be an issue for aircraft which may be forced to operate at lower altitudes. LSA advised that Mersea Island is situated below controlled airspace that was implemented in 2015 and confirmed that it was not their intention to alter the pre-existing airspace arrangements. They explained that there would be no change to the way in which aircraft operate in that area and referenced the contents of the UK Aeronautical Information Publication with regards to navigation warnings, particularly with regards to bird migration and areas with sensitive fauna (ENR 5.6).</p> <p><b><u>Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) / In Combination Assessment</u></b></p> <p>Natural England suggested that there was insufficient information contained within the consultation document to allow the competent authority (i.e. the CAA) to complete an HRA. They also stated that an in-combination assessment of other plans and projects would be required to determine whether any changes to surface traffic and aircraft traffic would result in additional emissions and if so, whether they are likely to have a significant impact on European sites. LSA facilitated a meeting with Natural England to discuss their submission further and made a commitment to seek further guidance from the CAA. Clarification and guidance was subsequently provided to LSA by email correspondence, but it has not been possible to determine whether this was shared with Natural England.</p> <p>In summary, I am satisfied that the change sponsors has a) considered the stakeholder feedback and b) provided an adequate and reasonable response to it.</p> |
|--|--|

|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| <b>2.</b> | <b>Recommendations / Conditions / PIR Data Requirements</b>  |            |
| 2.1       | <b>Are there any Recommendations which the change sponsor <u>should try</u> to address either before or after implementation (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.</b>  | <b>N/A</b> |
|           | N/A  |            |
| 2.2       | <b>Are there any Condition(s) which the change sponsor <u>must fulfil</u> either before or after implementation (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.</b>   | <b>YES</b> |
|           | <p>If the proposal is approved, prior to implementation the change sponsor <u>must</u> ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• any local agreements with the Danger Area Operator with regards to the operation of EG D138 are revisited, updated and agreed accordingly – see feedback from MoD DAATM.</li> <li>• agreed ATC procedures and service levels are included within an updated Letter of Agreement – see feedback from NATS.</li> <li>• they fully coordinate their implementation programme with NATS (NERL) – see feedback from NATS.</li> </ul> |            |

|   |   |            |
|---|---|------------|
| 2.3   | <b>Are there any specific requirements in terms of the data to be collected by the change sponsor for the Post Implementation Review (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.</b> | <b>YES</b> |
| <p>The change sponsor is required to collate related stakeholder observations (enquiry/complaint data) and present it to the CAA. Any location/area from where more than 10 individuals have made enquiries/complaints must be plotted on separate maps displaying a representative sample of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• aircraft track data plots; and</li> <li>• traffic density plots</li> </ul> <p>The plots should include a typical days-worth of movements from the last month of each standard calendar quarter (March, June, September, December) from each of the years directly preceding and following implementation of the airspace change proposal.</p> <p>The change sponsor should also collate information and report on instances where access to its controlled airspace, particularly CTA's 10X and 11, has been denied. This information will be considered alongside any relevant FCS 1521 – Use of UK Airspace Report submissions made directly to the CAA concerning denied airspace access as part of the Post Implementation Review.</p> <p>Finally, the change sponsor should closely monitor any changes in aircraft behaviour, particular within the boundary of the proposed controlled airspace, that might have a significant effect in terms of the overflight of the Outer Thames Estuary SPA and report on it accordingly.</p> |   |            |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>General Summary/Conclusions</b>  |  |
| <p>As detailed above, the CAA had previously confirmed that there was no requirement for LSA to undertake further consultation in relation to their proposal to implement CTA's 10X and 11. Consequently, the purpose of this additional engagement activity was to ensure that LSA were keeping stakeholders fully informed of the follow-up proposal for CTA's 10X and 11 and allowing them an opportunity to comment on it accordingly. LSA has satisfied this requirement by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Producing a 50-page engagement document, which provided enough information for the reader to understand the scope/purpose of this engagement activity and the current/future state of operations within the respective portions of controlled airspace.</li> <li>• Distributing the engagement document to a total of 185 stakeholders, publishing it on a dedicated airport webpage (which received 508 views between 19<sup>th</sup> July and 30<sup>th</sup> November) and facilitating related open events/briefings/meetings</li> <li>• Analysing and considering the feedback received from stakeholders; although they were disappointed with the low response rate, the change sponsor provided suitable opportunities and enough time for stakeholders to review the details of the proposal and provide their response. Whilst no modifications were made to the proposal because of the stakeholder feedback, the change sponsor has fairly and accurately</li> </ul> |  |

identified the key areas of concern and it's clear that these have each been considered, with the change sponsor providing a perfectly fair and reasonable response in all cases.

It is therefore my conclusion that the engagement activities undertaken by the change sponsor in relation to this airspace change proposal satisfy regulatory requirements and that this element of it should be approved.

| Engagement Assessment Sign-off/ Approvals | Name  | Signature  | Date      |
|---|---|--|-----------|
| Engagement Assessment completed by:       | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> (Communities & Coordination) | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 40px;"></div> | 25/2/2020 |
| Engagement Assessment approved by:        | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Mgr AR                       | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 40px;"></div> | 11/05/20  |
| Mgr AR Comments: No comment.              |   |  |           |

| Hd AAA Comment/ Approval                    | Name   | Signature  | Date       |
|---|--|--|------------|
| Engagement Assessment Conclusions approved: | <div style="background-color: black; width: 60px; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Hd AAA | <div style="background-color: black; width: 150px; height: 60px;"></div> | 19/06/2020 |



Hd AAA Comments: No comments